



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/764,493	01/17/2001	Arthur Charles Thomas Huston	50269-0039	7203
29989	7590 09/29/2	005	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			BAROT, I	BHARAT
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	e Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20050919
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB, Paper No(s)/Mail Date	/08) 5) 🔲 N	terview Summary (PTO-413) aper No(s)/Mail Date otice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) ther:
•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified cop	ies not received.
application from the International Bu	•	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	oriority documents hav	e been received in this National Stage
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been receiv	ed.
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	igh phonty under 66 c	
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eian priority under 35 l	J.S.C. & 119(a)-(d) or (f)
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the a	ttached Office Action or form PTO-152.
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	· ·	
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		cted to by the Examiner.
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
Application Papers		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirem	ent.
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-70 and 77-90</u> is/are rejected.		•
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	urawir nom considerat	IUII.
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-70 and 77-90</u> is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	• •	ion
<u> </u>	ha annlication	
Disposition of Claims	•	
closed in accordance with the practice und	•	• •
3) Since this application is in condition for allo		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>1</u> 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ 1	<u>8 July 2005</u> . This action is non-final	•
_	8 July 2005	
Status		•
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS CON R 1.136(a). In no event, however, riod will apply and will expire SI atute, cause the application to b	MMUNICATION. er, may a reply be timely filed X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. secome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE	PLY IS SET TO EXPI	RE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS.
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover s	sheet with the correspondence address
	Bharat N. Barot	2155
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	09/764,493	THOMAS HUSTON ET AL.
/	Application No.	1

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Claims 1-70 and 77-90 remain for further examination and pending.

The old rejection maintained

2. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on April 14, 2005. The claim rejection of previous office action mailed on April 14, 2005 is incorporated herein by reference.

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-70 and 77-90 filed on July 18, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the claims 1-70 and 77-90.
- 4. Applicant's arguments under 35 USC 112 first paragraph and under USC 112 second paragraph are not persuasive and rejection of claims 1-70 and 77-90 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph and under USC 112 second paragraph stands.
- 5. In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

Application/Control Number: 09/764,493

Art Unit: 2155

Argument: Keesey does not teach or suggest the claim 1 limitations "detecting, independent..."

Response: Keesey teaches the steps of: detecting, independent of any request for the data, that a second more recent version of the data is available (column 7 lines 25-30, Keesey discloses that a request for more recent versions of the document are requested from the origin server, new versions could be pushed downstream to any DSS that has previously requested the document independently of the user request and inquire processes discussed in figures 4-6); and in response to detecting, independent of any request for the data, that the second more recent version of the data is available, requesting the second more recent versions of the data be supplied to the cache, and storing in the cache the second more recent version of the data (column 7 lines 1-30, Kqesey discloses that a more recent version of the documents cached are requested and stored in the cache server, new versions could be pushed downstream to any DSS that has previously requested the document independently of the user request and inquiry processes discussed in figures 4-6).

In response to applicant's argument that Keesey does not teach or suggest the claim 1 limitations "detecting, independent... and in response to detecting, independent...", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Application/Control Number: 09/764,493 Page 4

Art Unit: 2155

6. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

7. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571) 272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, <u>Saleh Najjar</u>, can be reached at (571) 272-4006.

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

September 19, 200

Bhorst Bess t.
BHARAT BAROT
DRIMARY EXAMINER